

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated October 20, 2004 is respectfully requested. Claims 1-13 have been cancelled, while new claims 14-31 have been added. As such, claims 14-31 are currently pending.

New claims 14-18 recite similar limitations to those recited in now-cancelled claims 1-5, respectively. Claim 14, from which claims 15-22 depend, recites that the best match for a plurality of values is determined by traversing a second tree. Support for this feature may be found in the Specification, as for example from page 8 at line 7 to page 9 at line 13, and also on page 6 at lines 30-31. New claim 19 recites that the best match is associated with the first and third values of the plurality of values. Support for this new claim may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 6 at lines 27-31. New claim 20 recites that the best match is associated with the first and second values of the plurality of values. This limitation was previously presented in now-cancelled claim 1. New claim 21 recites that the best match is associated with the first, second, and third values of the plurality of values. Support for this new claim may be found, for instance, at lines 30-31 of page 6 in the Specification. New claim 22 recites that a first value indicates a desired value for a first field in a table and that a second value indicates a desired value for a second field in the table. Support for this new claim may be found in the Specification, e.g., on page 2 at lines 29-31. New claim 23 recites that the best match for the plurality of values is the best match for at least two of the first value, the second value, and the third value. Support for this new claim may be found in the Specification, e.g., on page 6 at lines 27-31.

New claim 24 recites similar limitations to those recited in new claim 14, while new claim 25 recites similar limitations to those recited in now-cancelled claim 7. New claims 26-29 recite similar limitations to those originally recited in now-cancelled claims 1-4. New claim 30 recites similar limitations to those recited in new claim 26, and new claim 31 recites similar limitations to those recited in new claim 25.

The Specification has been amended to include the U.S. Patent number for the patent which issued on January 13, 2004 based on the parent to the instant application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-13 were all rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-13 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,678,675. In an effort to overcome the Examiner's rejections of the claims, claims 1-13 have been canceled. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are now moot.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 446-8690.

Respectfully submitted,



Peggy A. Su
Reg. No. 41,336

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN LLP
12930 Saratoga Ave., Suite D1
Saratoga, CA 95070
Tel: 408-446-8690
Fax: 408-446-8691